

Leca, Corina

Adaptation of the "Tool for Quality Assurance of Education for Democratic Citizenship in Schools" - Two years of experience in Romania

Trends in Bildung international (2009) 21, S. 1-29



Quellenangabe/ Reference:

Leca, Corina: Adaptation of the "Tool for Quality Assurance of Education for Democratic Citizenship in Schools" - Two years of experience in Romania - In: *Trends in Bildung international* (2009) 21, S. 1-29 - URN: urn:nbn:de:0111-opus-50657 - DOI: 10.25656/01:5065

<https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0111-opus-50657>

<https://doi.org/10.25656/01:5065>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Die Nutzung stellt keine Übertragung des Eigentumsrechts an diesem Dokument dar und gilt vorbehaltlich der folgenden Einschränkungen: Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

Terms of use

We grant a non-exclusive, non-transferable, individual and limited right to using this document.

This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. Use of this document does not include any transfer of property rights and it is conditional to the following limitations: All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

Kontakt / Contact:

peDOCS
DIPF | Leibniz-Institut für Bildungsforschung und Bildungsinformation
Informationszentrum (IZ) Bildung
E-Mail: pedocs@dipf.de
Internet: www.pedocs.de

Mitglied der


Leibniz-Gemeinschaft

Corina Leca

Adaptation of the "Tool for Quality Assurance of Education for Democratic Citizenship in Schools" - Two years of experience in Romania

March 2009

Contents

1. Project's rationales
2. Institutional framework, parties' responsibilities
3. Project description
 - a. School engagement*
 - b. Support for schools*
 - c. School response*
 - d. Project stages – Year 1*
 - e. Year 1 results/added value*
 - f. Project stages – Year 2*
4. Conclusions and recommendations

Annex 1 - Participating schools

Annex 2 - EDC evaluation framework

Annex 3 – School evaluation report

Annex 4 – EDC policy and development plan

Project's rationales

The main characteristic of the Quality Assurance of EDC Project is its individual-oriented dimension. It means that the topic was before everything and anything else a major interest of a group of educationists – mainly teachers – that have been working together for a while and passed through specific professional stages (emphasizing skills such as evaluation, critical thinking etc.) based on various projects run by local NGOs. The core group gathered other teachers sharing the same philosophy – their genuine concern in self-evaluation and peer evaluation of the EDC work run at various levels: class, school, learning unit, school-based project, community project etc. At the same time, the initiators of the project analysed in the following pages regarded this matter as a very natural and efficient way to develop themselves and help their colleagues with their professional development. Although EDC is a *group enterprise* by its nature, the project team wanted to improve its quality in a given school by involving really good *professionals* able to tailor coherent efficient EDC activities in that *school*.

Institutional framework, parties' responsibilities

The Council of Europe's *Tool for Quality Assurance in EDC in Schools* was the theoretical basis of the first Romanian project on this issue. It was carried out by TEHNE¹, the Romanian Center for Innovation and Development in Education (www.tehne.ro), an NGO based in Bucharest between October 2006 and September 2007. The project encompassed six schools in Dimbovita county (see Annex 1) and was financially supported by the US Embassy in Bucharest (through Democracy Commission Small Grants). The second phase of the project started in September 2008 and is running by the "Friendship Ambassadors"², an association based in Tirgoviste, the main town of Dimbovita county. The current stage comprises eight schools (see Annex 1) and is funded by the US Embassy and the Council of Europe. It is to be concluded in August 2009.

TEHNE as well as the "Friendship Ambassadors" Association have good relationships with both national and local educational authorities. The local in-service teacher training center (CCD Dimbovita) signed a partnership agreement with the two NGOs that carried out the two stages of the project. The local school inspectorate also acknowledged the importance of the project and through its head, the History and management inspectors participated in various events of the project and promoted its ideals amongst the educationists they came in touch with. Prof. Cezar Birzea, the director of the Institute for Educational Sciences in Bucharest also endorsed the first phase of the project. A representative of the National Agency for Quality Assurance in Schools (ARACIP) participated in the evaluation workshop of the pilot project (September 2007) and underlined the connections between the project's approaches and the formal agency's strategy³. In September 2007 the project was introduced to the civic education teachers participating in an annual professional meeting. The project team kept the formal partners informed regarding all aspects and stages of the project but we do not know how they used the information and if they changed any part of their policy based on the project results. The first year of our project taught us the importance of a clear contract

¹ It is a non-profit organization, aiming to support educational initiatives through projects and programs covering areas of non-formal education, formal curriculum development, education for democratic citizenship, education through ICTs, elearning, lifelong learning, and in-service teacher training. Its members are researchers, academics, practitioners, combining different types of expertise: from grass-root level to decision-making.

² It was set up in 1997 by a group of teachers and parents based in a primary school. Its main goal was to help children and young people at risk due to HIV, poor families facing low income or social problems as well as old marginalized people. The association was founded as Romanian counterpart of a French association called Les Amis de Tirgoviste. Over years the association turned to more youth exchange projects and intercultural education activities.

³ Students and their families are regarded as school's partners. Education should be based on students' learning needs and interests which change over time. EDC is a major dimension of education quality. The whole school approach is the most efficient way to get quality in a given institution.

(comprising specific rights and responsibilities of the parties) with each participating school, thing which we did in September 2008. Actually, the analysis and negotiation of the contract was one of the most highly appreciated component of the initial workshop in the current stage.

The team of the pilot project (2006 – 2007) consisted of four people: a civic education teacher (Gabriela Cristache), a primary school teacher – Norica Oprea (who used to be a school inspector), a Mathematics teacher – Teodora Popa (who used to be a deputy principal of a high school and who is currently in charge of school management at the school inspectorate) and the co-ordinator (Corina Leca has been in charge of both projects). The general philosophy of this combination of professionals was to create a functional framework of individual competences and institutional links that could offer a realistic chance to implement a challenging idea: self-evaluation of the EDC activities carried out by various schools. Two teachers who participated in the pilot phase joined the team in the second year: Livia Grigorescu (a Physics teacher who is also a trainer at the local teacher training center) and Georgeta Dragna (a primary school teacher who is very skilled in the evaluation of students' competences and development planning). This is a clear indicator of success and it depicts our belief in learning by doing approach and the value of sharing ownership/authorship of a quite difficult enterprise.

The project teams designed the agendas of all workshops (two in the pilot stage and 5 in the current phase) and ran all training sessions. We also visited the participating schools at least once a month in the first stage and whenever it was necessary this year in order to assist the school teams with planning their evaluation, processing the results and designing the development planning, as well as to watch and analyse some EDC activities. The co-ordinator went to all schools. One or two schools were assigned to each trainer. We always worked in pairs. The co-ordinator also did the PR work and submitted all reports to the grantors.

The Council of Europe's Tool was dismantled/dissected and all major concepts, ideas and approaches were utilized in the pilot project. We did not forget any chapter, they were implemented step by step. Still we cannot state that we managed to build a quality assurance system in any of the participating schools. We just offered ourselves and the teachers an outstanding opportunity to deal with the entire vision depicted by the manual in a really practical way. The Tool was translated into Romanian in 2005 and we distributed several copies to all schools.

Project description

School engagement

In the first year, the project took place in the schools where trainers teach and in other schools recommended by these or which participated in former activities co-ordinated by the team. We wanted to have both high schools (two) and primary schools (four) based in towns (four) and villages (two). We did not select them according to democratic criteria or through a transparent process. The co-ordinator talked to all school principals and/or other decision makers of the candidate schools before the formal commence of the first stage. We wanted to understand if each school was aware of its responsibilities and the rationales of the project. After the co-ordinator – administrator discussion, all schools decided to be involved in the project. Then the schools selected the teachers based on our requirements (representatives of the management, civic education or social sciences department, primary and middle school units, and the commission on (self)evaluation) and their own interests and projects (a school principal wanted to promote young teachers who did not participate in many training sessions, other chose to develop certain components such as community-based projects or students' council). In some cases, we suggested the involvement of some former collaborators, teachers whose interest and competence in EDC, HRE or evaluation were repeatedly demonstrated in various circumstances. Each school team has a core group of 3-4 people who participate in the

training sessions held for the whole group of participants and a larger group (in the first year a school had 14 participating teachers) who carry out all project activities and are trained within school by the trainers in charge of that institution. In general, primary school teachers are much more willing and skilled to carry out student-centered EDC activities and evaluate them and their students' performance. They participate in more courses on various topics and they use that knowledge and experience in the QA Project. Although we expected a balanced number of primary and middle school teachers, the former is bigger. The middle and high school teachers do not necessarily teach civics, History or other social sciences. Many of them teach Geography, Romanian, foreign languages, Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Music, Psychology, Technology. This is how we have brought into life our deep belief that EDC is a whole school work that requires a holistic approach. If the school's administrators did not participate in the project or, at least, not on a regular basis (it happened more in the first stage than this year), he/she totally supported all activities or, at least, let them take place according to the teachers' and trainers' views and plans.

Support for schools

The project team offered two kinds of support to the participating schools: - more or less traditional **training sessions** (two/three-day school-based or general workshops) and - continuous **assistance to develop various products or to carry out various processes** (evaluation tools, EDC policy, EDC development plans, specific activity plans). In the pilot stage (2006 - 2007), there were two seminars (in the beginning and in the end) for all participants and one training meeting in each school. The latter was meant to consolidate the big team of each school, by training all participants of that school on the basic issues of the project correlated with the specific development needs of the respective institution. The assistance was provided for all school teams by pairs of trainers. Those two people went to each school at least once a month (even more often in the first semester) and facilitate the analysis, evaluation, and development planning processes. Unfortunately, the school people was not as (pro)active as they should have been in order to produce tools, policies, and plans which could be used by that institution in the long run. In general, they work hard, but they were not very creative and reflective when it came to tailor the EDC profile of their school. The *holistic approach* to EDC and school development was the most challenging task. We were not able to help school teams to envisage the *whole EDC picture* and even less to analyse and plan *its improvement*. This was the main reason why the changes were made in the second year. The biggest strategic difference between the two stages of the QA Project is the scope of analysis and planning: in the first year, schools had to build the whole EDC profile, while this year they may choose a narrow EDC component (either one of the areas described in the EDC evaluation framework or even a more specific thing) to plan school's development in that respect. In the current stage we have already run three workshops. There will be two more by the end of August, including the evaluation seminar. All seminars were attended by all school teams. The school-based counselling was much more need-oriented and the decision was left in school team's hands to a bigger extent. The association was given the EDC plans designed by the participating schools for this school year. Some of them invited us to participate in several activities. We analysed both those activities and the whole EDC framework and how the former fitted the latter, whenever a school asked us to help.

Moreover, this year there is a totally new component - a **good practice guide**. Each participating school is expected to contribute at least 5 activities/tools/students' products/beneficiaries' reactions/lessons learned/etc. to a collection of successful or efficient EDC activities. This guide and how it will come into life are the most direct way to illustrate one of the fundamental dimensions of our project: sharing ownership and/or authorship of any outcome and activity means to secure the democratic culture in a given school. At the same time, it educates an analytical and responsible conduct on the side of those stakeholders.

Both associations in charge of the project gave some supplies (paper, pens, markers etc. summing up to US\$100 per school) to all participating schools in order to support the EDC activities. It was a component of the budget approved by the grantors. Nevertheless, no school needed special financial support (either for teachers' work or materials) to fulfill its plans and promises.

School response

In general, the decision to participate in the pilot phase of project was made by the principals. As we have already mentioned, we asked some people we used to work with to join the project. They were interested in HRE and EDC. The QA dimension was a new challenge for them. Moreover, when we started the project, schools were facing a really difficult official requirement: the newly created ARACIP (The National Agency for Quality Assurance in Schools) was about to start evaluating schools in order to decide whether they were able to meet the national quality standards. Neither national nor local educational authorities, not even the pedagogical faculties designed any programme to train school people in the new procedures, evaluation tools or management approach. Although our project was dealing with EDC and not with the whole education undertaken in school, it was the only chance to make school stakeholders familiar with the very complex QA philosophy and methodology. We were very honest when telling the candidates that we could give them a complete QA framework based on the Council of Europe's policy and they could expand the method to the whole school activity. Responsible principals understood this and used the opportunity. In addition, both schools and teachers get credits⁴ for their involvement in various extra-curricular or international projects. Therefore, our project that was endorsed by the CCD Dimbovita (the local teacher training center) was quite tempting.

One of the two high schools involved in the first phase quitted after two months and we had to find another one. In spite of the highly enthusiastic team of the respective school, the principal did not accept the important amount of extra-work related to the project nor did she appreciate the changes brought by it. Fortunately, other high school in Tirgoviste was eager to participate and we managed to catch up with the general agenda. A primary school located in a village withdrew after the evaluation stage of the first year, without even starting the development planning. Those teachers were working there and at other schools at the same time, consequently they were not motivated to continue the team work because they did not feel like being a team. Although these two changes made our work even more difficult, we did not regard them as failures, but rather as authentic indicators of the very complex and challenging dimensions of the project. Those teachers and administrators could not understand that they were the first authors of their development or they were not interested in acting based on their own decisions.

Project stages – Year 1

The first year's **structure in terms of school work** was as follows:

- Each school team **thoroughly analysed the EDC profile** between October 2006 and April 2007 (there were many meetings dedicated to SWOT analyses, authoring and administering the evaluation tools, interpreting the results, and writing the reports). The teams decided to design various instruments: questionnaires for students, members of the Students' Council, teachers, parents (this was the only way they participated in the pilot project), members of the school board, principals, administrative staff; observation forms for lessons and other activities; interviews of school principals; and document

⁴ Teachers can get a bigger salary depending on the quality of their class and extra-class performance. In general, school principal and inspectors observe and grade teachers' activities. If the teacher participates in national, European or international projects or writes various articles/analyses/textbooks/etc. he/she gets more credits. Credits make the difference if a school has to reduce its number of teachers due to the less number of students.

analysis forms for various curriculum and management documents. Each school decided upon the number of people involved in the evaluation. In general, small schools collected questionnaires from half of their staff, while bigger schools got back up to two thirds. Primary school students were more rarely involved than middle school ones. About half to two thirds of students filled in questionnaires. Parents had a quite low participation, in general (under 10%). Only small schools managed to collect answers from half of their students' families. One school did not evaluate either the lessons or the documents. Actually, teaching and management documents were evaluated only by teachers from on school in the country side. Classes (History, Geography, Religion, Romanian and foreign languages, Music, Mathematics, educational lesson) were watched by the school principal in three schools and several members of the team in two schools. All teachers were quite reluctant to do this saying that their colleagues would not be happy to teach in their presence. Some elementary school teachers did not feel competent to observe junior secondary school classes and Mathematics teachers, for instance, did not want to go to History classes as they could not evaluate the scientific part of teaching. We did not agree with them because peer support, mutual coach, openness, accountability and friendly relationships were exactly what this project was challenging them to adopt or enhance as professional practice. However, those who accepted to observe other teachers' lessons became more willing to share their experience with other colleagues and asked their school principals to organize this practice on a regular basis. Other flaws of the observation forms were their too general items. The three principals (who are familiar with observing lessons) did not develop a *really EDC-type form*. Items like teacher's role – student's role, specific assessment tools and practice or links between class activity and community life are relevant to our project, but usually the observers looked at aspects they always evaluate when they observe a lesson. In general, each school team organized the EDC evaluation process by giving specific responsibilities to each member (somebody designed the tools, all team members and other teachers of that school administered them and only some of them processed the findings and wrote the reports).

- The project team developed a **general EDC evaluation framework** (see Annex 2) because after some attempts we could not get a specific framework from each school team. This was a major compromise we accepted for the sake of progress and at the cost of school specificity. The framework basically preserved the rubrics of the Council of Europe's framework and it was also rooted in the general environment of the participating schools as the project team perceived it.
- Each school team presented the **general report** (see Annex 3) to the whole staff of that school and, in some cases, to the Students' Council and parents' committee. We insisted to do it that way in order to underline the importance of transparency and accountability in a democratic learning community that we hope to build in the participating schools. All school people became aware of the strong and weak points of their institution and how they were connected with the non-EDC activity. A general problem of the reports (the general ones as well as the instrument-based ones) was the prevalence of quantitative analysis over the qualitative analysis. The participating teachers were not able to explain the meaning of many answers given by students, parents etc., they just listed the findings. Some of them even feared to state something so as not to offend the respondent group (i.g. questionnaires targeting parents or teachers) or to shed an unfavourable light on their school. The fact that ordinary teachers do not write reports and conduct analyses explains why the questions posed to various actors did not cover the whole EDC area and the meanings of their answers did not emphasize the real causes of school flaws and challenges. Sometimes teachers could not see how the way they use interactive methods at class or report back to their students' parents on some test scores reflects the level of democracy. The three facilitator-trainer people who work in schools (Teodora Popa, Norica Oprea and Gabriela Cristache) think that the participating teachers made a big effort to employ the self-oriented approaches offered by the project and meet its aims. Still I think that our projects

revealed important problems beyond the EDC/HRE sphere⁵ and the educational authorities at various levels (from school to county, at least) should read them very carefully and try to find solutions or/and accept our suggestions. Teachers should feel free and be able to develop their own instruments to understand the learning needs and interests of their students. They should decide on courses and workshops they attend based on their class needs and circumstances and not on the credits offered by the respective topics. Teachers should tell the school principals what problems they encounter at class or school level and not to keep silent in order to show how resourceful they are, or on the contrary, that they do not create any trouble. The EDC reports issued by the participating schools depict the values, habits, rules and procedures the stakeholders of those institutions appreciate and they should be used as change tools even beyond the EDC realm. The comprehensive evaluation report that has to be done by each school according to the existing regulations would find important data in the EDC reports and even more important aspects in the way they were produced.

- Under our close supervision, each school team outlined its **EDC policy** (comprising EDC values and principles, major development directions, and roles of the main actors) and the **EDC development planning** (see Annex 4) by August 2007. The project was a little bit prolonged because we could not collect the final products from all schools before the summer holiday and we wanted to run a really efficient evaluation workshop with all materials. As we mentioned above, this took place in September 2007. All school teams valued group work, equal chances/opportunities and responsibility very highly. Some schools expected their students to follow the example of the teachers in terms of *responsible conduct*, while other schools just listed responsibility as an outstanding principle of democracy. Although human rights and children's rights were not explicitly mentioned in all documents, respect for human dignity and diversity were still at the core. The link between school and community was also very clearly emphasized by all teams: schools have to run their activity based on the broad community needs and interests and they also have to strive for embedding democracy values and principles in the given community. However, a middle school in Tirgoviste tilted the balance in favour of the internal process that has to be of high quality and not in favour of how this quality mirrors the community's concerns. The findings of the evaluation process (major shortcomings and realistic resources) were at the origin of the development directions. The third component of the EDC policy (the main actors' roles) troubled all teams to some extent. The participating teachers could not link goals and people supposed to fulfill them very specifically and directly. All but one team regarded community as an important EDC actor. The fact that the school did not mention community *explicitly* could be connected with its self-oriented development approach. This team totally relied on school resources and paid much attention to the professionalism of its staff that had *to offer good services* to the local community and was not seen as the community's partner. The school development planning followed, in general, the design suggested by our team: major development directions – aims – activities – human resources (including specific responsibilities) – other resources – timing/deadlines – indicators/success evidence. According to the final evaluation findings, the participants felt much more comfortable to develop this document than the EDC policy. Its more practical character fits the practitioners' needs and expectations better than a visionary document can do. Both documents were voted by the teachers' board of each school and became mandatory for 2007 – 2008 school year.

⁵ They cannot communicate to each other efficiently; do not dare to pose difficult, uncomfortable questions to one another or to their school principal; have no courage to explain the meaning of their research findings or to request explanations from people holding unfulfilled duties; do not take responsibility for their individual decisions and actions, preferring to hide in collective work; do not act as doers/creators/etc. of various things, they choose to be users/beneficiaries/etc. of new regulations/ methods/projects/etc.; do not see the complex network of development landmarks – objectives – activities – achievement indicators that has to be developed in order to shape the quality assurance system at school level; do not regard themselves as first change agents of their professional life, blaming the group, the school, the system etc. for any shortcoming.

All evaluation tools, reports, SWOT analyses, EDC policies and the development plans were put on CDs and distributed to schools in Tirgoviste. Some components were also posted on TEHNE's site – www.tehne.ro. Some inspectors and teachers working in other counties asked us to invite them to other QA in EDC seminars or to involve their institutions in the next stage of the project. We have to honestly assert that the complexity of the project combined with the scarcity of our resources (both material/financial and human) made our project team somehow isolated and self-oriented. We did not have time to design and implement a PR plan or at least to make a leaflet to send it to all school inspectorates in Romania and to various educational entities in Romania or abroad.

Year 1 results/added value

The mere fact that ordinary teachers performed a complex analysis and reported back to their peers, students and parents was an extraordinary professional change in all participating schools. They did assume the freedom and responsibility embedded in a democratic community. After the pilot project, most of the participating teachers joined the commission for (self)evaluation and quality assurance of their schools as feeling competent to turn those entities to their “normal” and officially stated functions. Some teachers used various parts of the project (e.g. the evaluation process carried out in school, certain tools, some parts of the EDC policy etc.) in their M.A. thesis⁶ or research papers submitted to various institutions. More and more teachers use self-evaluation and mutual evaluation in their daily work, not only in the EDC field. Some teachers started to extensively use evaluation to improve their teaching. They connect lessons and teaching-learning units based on how students performed at a certain moment of the process. At the same time, they *involve students as well as parents in running and analysing their EDC activities*. They started to *share the ownership of the teaching-learning enterprise* and this is a crucial change. Unfortunately, we cannot assert that the important documents (i.g. the EDC policy and the development plan) issued at the end of the first year were closely and carefully implemented. Although they were fully included in the general development plan of those schools, only some small parts of them were enforced. Our co-ordinating group did not have resources to assist the 5 schools in their first year of the EDC development. Fortunately, last summer, the “Friendship Ambassadors” Association got the second grant from the US Embassy (that was increased by the Council of Europe) and we could start the second phase of the QA Project based on the lessons we had learned in the pilot stage. The participating schools have not made institutional changes (at least, not so far). We did not identify proofs of self-sustainable EDC *at the school level*. However, people working in the participating schools (not only teachers who took part in the QA Project) started to perceive EDC as a major component and a condition of quality in education. They do not necessarily carry out *explicit* EDC activities, but they pay attention to the relationships between their class or school work and the daily life and environment of their students or, at least, the genuine learning needs of their students. These changes were reported by the teachers themselves, their school principals or were seen by our team while we were visiting those schools.

Taking into consideration the above mentioned outcomes and effects, we can conclude that the first year of the QA Project was an attempt to turn some schools to a normal profile as it is described in the bounding documents⁷. The written procedures became daily realities in the participating schools, to some extent. We did not take or push them to an exceptional standard, we just helped them be self-conscious about their quality.

Project stages – Year 2

⁶ More and more teachers get these credentials in order to earn bigger salaries, secure their jobs or find better ones.

⁷ Standards issued by the National Agency for Quality Assurance in Schools (ARACIP).

The second year of the QA Project means both a chance to continue what we planned and the opportunity to evaluate the impact of the first phase. At the initial seminar of the current project, held in September 2008, our larger team (6 trainers instead of 4 in the first year) happily found out a certain degree of sustainability related to our endeavour. The presentations made by the three old schools really impressed the representatives of the new schools and gave them a very rich and vivid image of the complexity of the QA in EDC work. They presented various activities (against violence among young people, environment education, family-school partnerships etc.) that illustrated both EDC content and interactive methodology.

The first stage of the project was rather *individual-oriented*. It is not surprising that in only one year we did not succeed in changing the *democratic culture* of any of the participating schools. This year we decided to focus rather on institutions than on teachers. We conceived the framework, but we let schools act according to their capabilities and goals. The technical change was that we did not ask them to evaluate and plan the development of the *entire EDC field* (the three areas of the Tool). Each school could limit itself to any EDC component (based on the evaluation framework we tailored in the first year) it wanted, irrespective of its scope (it could be even a narrow thing such as giving substance to the Students' Council). Sometimes we had to use much energy to convince schools to stick with a specific goal instead of striving to achieve everything.

The six important lessons learned by our team in the pilot project and underlined in the final report submitted to the US Embassy in October 2007 were carefully analysed when we expanded the project: - it is not efficient to distribute more materials than we can explore/study together with teachers, because most of them remain unopened;

- school has to take the whole responsibility (and risk) for the team membership, each team should decide whether to keep (or not) people who do not work diligently;
- the school team should set up some work rules and principles;
- we have to be aware of the general EDC profile/experience of the respective school before starting a complex QA project (*it is inefficient to run such a project in schools without a substantive EDC activity*);
- school teams have to meet and work together as much as possible in order to check and improve their understanding of EDC and evaluation techniques;
- school principal's support is crucial if it is to create a quality assurance system at school level.

We have invited new schools based on precise indicators of *interest* and competence: teachers with some experience (even papers) in various aspects of evaluation, a "normal" EDC agenda (i.g. activities that are *necessary to be carried out* in order to *meet the goals set up by that school*) and *explicit willingness* to join the project. The project is a challenge to help schools self-develop, therefore they were supposed to have a genuine interest in this. At the same time, we kept the objective criteria: rural and urban areas, primary schools and high schools.

We have underlined from the very outset that the whole responsibility regarding the individuals' performance is placed on each team's shoulders, our NGO has got partnerships with schools, not with teachers. Within the first workshop (held in September 2008) we negotiated the partnership. We stated the NGO's responsibilities and let each school team outline its duties. Then we kept what everybody accepted and the whole school team (including the principal) signed the agreement. The method was highly valued and some schools started to use it in other circumstances. Although we have kept distributing many materials related to the general QA context in Romania as well as democratic governance of schools, participants had the chance to analyse some of them in a special session. After each group had fulfilled its assignment, it presented its main aspects and its relevance to the respective school. Many participants rated this activity as one of the most efficient of that workshop. The participation of all school's principals is much more responsible than in the first year. There is no doubt that all schools carry out numerous EDC activities (we were invited many times), consequently we have the critical mass to build QA of EDC. Still we are not sure to what extent each school team plans specific EDC activities *as a team*. Even less do we know how a school team

relates a certain EDC activity to the EDC development plan. The activities envisaged by the participating schools are quite diverse and they really mirror the major public issues. However, they do not let an observer see a clear goal and the way, the process towards it. This is the most important challenge the project team is facing this year. How to inspire, train, convince etc. school professionals to make this crucial paradigm shift? To decide *what* they want to achieve and assume the rationales (*why*) and *then* design a plan to that aim (*how*). And do this all the time.

The fact that our NGO and the local teacher training center (CCD Dimbovita) are official partners makes us believe that the results of this stage will be attentively analysed by the local educational authority and our recommendations will be taken into consideration by the decision makers. We shall also send a report or some brief conclusions to the National Agency for Quality Assurance in Schools (ARACIP) and we hope they will consider our practical approach to quality assurance in EDC in designing their national policies and projects, at least regarding the staff development.

Besides all these plans, our main concern is to get substantive specific reports from the participating schools (not necessarily long, but definitely clear and realistic). We want them to be able to put together their development plans *as a team*. We want to create a small efficient team of EDC activists in each school. We want them to be the agents of change who can implement a quality assurance system into that institution. According to the current project's goals, the participating schools should work as resource centers if not as a network aiming at convincing other institutions in Dimbovita county to employ a similar development methodology. The determination of some of the participating teachers as well as their good results in learning by doing approach make us confident. The recent seminar dedicated to the development of the "Good Practice Guide" re-emphasised our belief that by working together on (self)evaluation and development planning, a group of professionals can get amazing outcomes. Individuals inspire, challenge and motivate each other and they manage to become authors and owners of a shared/group result.

The "Friendship Ambassadors" Association is trying to get financial support to continue school assistance beyond this school year. The alternative would be to implement small scale projects through the CCD Dimbovita. We could use the EU or other funds (e.g. European Social Fund, European Regional Development Fund, World Bank Small Grants Programme) in this respect. Our NGO and the team project are a good example of learning by doing approach in adult education. At the same time, by being transparent and self-demanding we depict the major principles of the QA of EDC strategy. In our opinion, the QA of EDC Project is a way to fulfill some common educational goals stated by our national authorities. We did not develop a new educational politics. We are just trying to show how ordinary school people should think and act in order to give their profession its inherent social and political importance. Moreover, we want to illustrate how responsible conduct (i.g. school people decide what, why and how they do on their own) can help the educational reform at grass roots level. This is the value added by our project to the existing educational policies: *how* to bring wise strategies into life.

Conclusions and recommendations

We strongly support the idea of multiplying this kind of project at local level, even school level. We do believe that the cultural background, habits and rules are crucial for the way of performing a successful educational activity. The EDC reports written by the participating schools in the first year depict various *qualities*. The quality of EDC in schools is not the same all over Romania. *Average* in one school might be *exceptional* in another school. A certain EDC aspect might be unattainable in a given learning community (at a certain moment) and perfectly touchable in a different place. Each school knows what it can do and what is desirable to be done in order to achieve specific standards.

The big value of the Tool resides, in our opinion, in how it helps an institution outline *its own quality concept* and *bring in into life*. The external evaluation is also necessary, but it can be really helpful only when its findings and recommendations are internalized. The creation freedom has to belong to each school. How to value and utilize it is a learning by doing process that turns a school from a “consumers maker” to a “free and responsible citizens maker” through a long process. The lack of democratic experience is one more major challenge when it comes to use the Tool in a post communist country, but it makes this change even more necessary.

The team that carries out this project comprises five school practitioners who think globally and act locally. If each school would have such a team, we could hope to reform the educational system of this country by itself. The most important message stemming from our work is that once it is defined/tailored, *a quality needs time* in order to be acknowledged and performed on a regular basis. But what quality means is a question of history, education, openness and critical thinking skills of those who build it. The EDC cannot be better than the stakeholders involved in this kind of education, but it can push or guide or lead them and the whole institution to a higher level of performance in a way other dimensions of education do not do. In this respect it is self-sustainable. The QA of EDC Tool gave us the great opportunity to test our faith and train our skills. Who could waste such a chance?

Annex 1 - Participating schools

The first year/Pilot phase (2006 - 2007)

“Nicolae Ciorănescu” Vocational High School in Tîrgoviște, 11 teachers

The School in Lazuri, 6 teachers

The School in Mănești - Ungureni, 6 teachers - withdrew before the formal end

„Grigore Alexandrescu” School in Tîrgoviște, 7 teachers

„I. Alexandru Brătescu-Voinești” School in Tîrgoviște, 14 teachers

“Vladimir Streinu” National College in Găești, 6 teachers

The second year (2008 - 2009)

„I. Alexandru Brătescu-Voinești” School in Tîrgoviște, 4 teachers

“Nicolae Ciorănescu” Vocational High School in Tîrgoviște, 5 teachers

“Vladimir Streinu” National College in Găești, 4 teachers

“Petru Cercel” High School in Tîrgoviște, 8 teachers

The School in Gura Ocniței, 4 teachers

“Mihai Viteazul” High School in Vișina, 6 teachers

The School in Răzvad (+ Valea Voievozilor), 6 teachers

„Mihai Viteazul” School in Tîrgoviște, 5 teachers

Annex 2 - EDC evaluation framework

Areas	Quality Indicators	Subthemes/Descriptors
Curriculum, teaching and learning	1. EDC weight in purpose, policy and curricula of the school	EDC elements in school policy/mission statement EDC components in all compulsory and elective subjects as well as in any other activity EDC objectives, themes, activities etc. match one another (support and emphasise each other)
	2. EDC principles embedded in teaching-learning style, strategies, and methods	EDC objectives weight in lesson plans and performance The interdependence of the three types of objectives (knowledge, skills, behaviours) Cross-curricular EDC approach Utilising methods/strategies that meet students' needs and interests Techniques and exercises to enhance students responsibility
	3. EDC mirrored in evaluation conception and practice	Students are involved in setting the evaluation objectives, criteria and methods Monitoring and improving students' progress Types and frequency of using the individual and group self-evaluation as well as peer evaluation
	4. students' learning outcomes of various activities	Knowing human rights and responsibilities/state bodies' powers/HR history/HR personalities/etc. Understanding the grounds of state-citizens relationship in a democracy Civic participation Group work skills Decision making skills Using (public) information Non-violent conflict resolution Debate and deliberation skills (dealing with controversial issues) Valuing diversity and human dignity

School climate and ethos		Responsibility Etc. (schools set up their own HRE/EDC agenda)
	5. the school physical environment illustrates EDC principles and values (rights and responsibilities, valuing diversity and civic participation)	<p>Equal access to all classrooms and other premises</p> <p>Security (floor, stairs, windows etc.)</p> <p>Open doors of administrative and secretariat department</p> <p>Posters, drawings, graphics, decorations made by students</p> <p>Availability of all information necessary for parents, students, other people entering school (timetable, regulations, teachers' duties, SC board etc.)</p> <p>Proper books, magazines, materials, Internet access etc. in school library, labs, other classrooms</p> <p>Display of students' and teachers' achievements</p>
	6. the rules and guidelines reflect EDC principles and values (rights and responsibilities, valuing diversity and civic participation)	<p>School regulations (mainly rights and responsibilities of students and teachers)</p> <p>The relationship between action/conduct, sanctions and rewards</p> <p>Guidelines for various activities carried out in school (contests, partnerships, academic Olympics etc.)</p> <p>School – community relationship (powers/responsibilities of each party)</p> <p>Written partnership school-family</p> <p>Students' Council regulations (specific responsibilities, relationship between students and the co-ordinator)</p> <p>Conflict resolution regulations</p>
	7. the daily life of school depicts EDC principles and values (rights and responsibilities, valuing diversity and civic participation)	<p>Values promoted by school</p> <p>Mutual expectations (school-families)</p> <p>Appointment/Consultation agenda of teachers and administration (according to students' timetable and parents' availability)</p> <p>Stakeholders' roles in designing the regulations</p> <p>How the rules are enforced (according to the</p>

		<p>regulations, based on concrete circumstances, are there exemptions or double standards?)</p> <p>Conflict resolution practice (are the actors involved in solving the problems?)</p> <p>Concrete group work practice at different levels</p> <p>Relationships within a community of teachers (respect, trust, co-operation, friendship etc.?)</p> <p>Relationships among students (even those who are not classmates)</p> <p>Relationships between school and students' families</p> <p>Relationships among all stakeholders</p> <p>Organising various events (specific roles – who makes decisions, who enforces them?)</p>
Management and development	8. co-operation/team work culture	<p>EDC values and principles are embraced by most of the stakeholders</p> <p>People know their roles and responsibilities, these are complementary</p> <p>Communication encourages creativity and responsibility</p> <p>People trust each other</p> <p>People respect each other</p> <p>Democratic decision making procedures</p> <p>Results are reported back periodically (by the administration, the other people, there are specific regulations in this respect and they are observed)</p> <p>People (self)evaluate their group work skills and the result of this work</p>
	9. how the school responds/reacts/accommodates to the various challenges of reality (both requirements coming from the ministry, inspectorate etc. and specific needs of the community/society)	<p>Proper access to general and specific information (laws, regulations, requests, messages from the local community etc.)</p> <p>Analysing the learning needs&interests of that community (questionnaires for parents, partnerships with various NGOs)</p> <p>School policy concerning violence, discrimination and</p>

		<p>so on</p> <p>What students, parents etc. say about how school react to violence and other problems or challenges</p> <p>EDC weight in school's (re)action to crises/difficult situations/unforeseeable situations</p> <p>Feedback policy and practice (to the upper level, among peers, between teachers and administration, between school and family)</p> <p>Interest in new things, even controversial issues</p> <p>Critical thinking approach (various actors and circumstances)</p> <p>Continuous analysis of training/development needs</p> <p>Being aware of and promoting the most modern strategies</p> <p>Equal access to professional development resources (courses, scholarships etc.)</p> <p>Staff recruitment policy</p> <p>Reward system (criteria, decision makers etc.)</p> <p>The weight of students' and parents' input in teacher evaluation</p> <p>The role of self-evaluation and peer evaluation</p> <p>Personal/Individual development plans (if they exist and are integrated in the institutional development planning)</p> <p>Identifying various needs (including by asking students)</p> <p>Equal access to resources or access based on the needs identified by the group</p> <p>Using community resources (resource persons, museums local media etc.)</p> <p>Lobby in order to get local resources</p> <p>Monitoring how the resources are utilized (are the goals met?)</p> <p>How efficient teachers use resources</p>
	10. professional development policy (are people seen as the main resource of that school?)	
	11. management of resources (others than people)	

	How efficient beneficiaries (students and parents) use resources Reporting back to beneficiaries, teachers etc.
12. EDC weight in school development planning	Who and how may contribute to the school development planning Are there 1/3/5/etc.-year plans? How progress is monitored? Does school development planning stem from the community/district/county development planning? The relationship between professional development planning and school development planning (synergy) How the outcomes are reported back to parents, students, community? (according to a plan, when the beneficiaries ask it etc.) Self-evaluation and peer evaluation status (who uses it, how is it used etc.)

Annex 3 – School evaluation report

Quality Assurance of Education for Democratic Citizenship, TEHNE-CCD, 2007

Democracy Commission Small Grants – US Embassy, Bucharest

„VLADIMIR STREINU” National College, Găești

FINAL REPORT

In this activity were questioned 302 students from a total of 814 (three classes for each year), 25 members of the Students' Council (from 32), 22 teachers (from 60), 6 members of the School Board (from 10) and 41 parents out of the 106 representatives of the Parents Committee. We can mention that the students and the parents showed a lot of interest in the problem, but we can't say the same thing about the teachers, only 30% of them answered the questions.

The results will be presented on three major domains: Curriculum – teaching – learning, Ethos – climate and Management – development.

Curriculum – teaching – learning

Principles of the education for democratic citizenship in the style, the strategy, and the methods

The teachers consider that the most representative characteristics of the democracy in the school are:

- equality of chances;
- collaboration;
- following the rules;
- the participation of the students and teachers in the collective management;
- communication.

The members of the School Board added:

- stimulating the performance;
- eliminating the preconceived ideas and discrimination;
- development of different projects based on rights and responsibilities.

We can see that, due to the role they have, the members of the School Board, added an idea about the future development.

Regarding the reflection of the EDC in the conception and practice of evaluation, 72 % of the students consider themselves involved sometimes and only 5% always. The students can rarely recognize themselves in the evaluation made by other colleagues (58%), and even a bigger number cannot recognize themselves in the evaluation made by the teachers (62%). 50% of the parents agree that the students are evaluated correctly. The questioned teachers tell that they use the peer evaluation seldom (75%), but self – evaluation often (75%).

The subjects where the student receives information regarding human rights are, mainly, history (86%), form-class (72%), socio-humanistic subjects (45%), the students mentioned (in smaller percentage) almost all the subjects.

We can see that almost all the subjects are mentioned (a good thing!), this showing the interest (on both sides) in this area.

The subjects or activities where the students have to made projects and work in small groups are mainly the form-classes and history (62%), socio-humanistic subjects (26%) but a big number of students mentioned none (6%). The majority of students agreed that this activities are helpful (82%), justifying trough the help for integration in the society, a better information and a better preparation for the future. This is why this can be a strong argument for using this methods by all the teachers.

The students think that the school offers information (68%), education (43%), culture (16%), a small number of students mentioning “Teachers as models to follow” (8%). It is a strong bad signal, because, in general, the low usage of the interactive methods comes with a big amount of information, presented in an unattractive way.

The students appreciated that between 34% and 66% of the teachers respect the personality of the student and the same number uses the active-participative methods, although all the questioned teachers mentioned at least two advantages of using these methods (a good working atmosphere, the students are better understood by the teachers, a big amount of knowledge assimilated in the class-room etc.). Only 37% of the parents think that the strategies and methods used by the teachers are student-centered.

All the questioned teachers showed that what they appreciate the most at the student is the way of communication, 25% talking also about the personal initiative. The small number of teachers that encourage the personal initiative is shown both by the students and the teachers, the students being more generous in their appreciation. So, the students appreciated that only 34 - 66% of the teachers encourage creativity.

The extracurricular activities offered by school are an important point for discussion. 63% of the students and 45% of the parents think that the extracurricular area meets the needs of the students. The result can be satisfying, but still, is not enough for the needs of the young students, the involvement they showed being remarkable: 84% of the students want to be involved in extracurricular activities.

Ethos – climate

The physical environment is characterized like this:

84% of the students consider the school spaces appropriate for the teaching-learning process. 50% of the parents think that the school has a good endowment and 52% of them think that this has a good use.

64% of the students consider the secretariat answers quickly to the requests. The members of the School Board, on a scale from 1 to 10, appreciate the performance of the secretariat with the mark 4.83, the accountancy with 4.66 and the administration with 3.66.

68% of the students consider that they receive enough information regarding the activities their school is involved in.

Everyday life:

Regarding the thing the school expect from them, the students’ opinions were various, on the first position being the civilized behavior, discipline and obeying the rules (72%), good results in learning (24%) and at the school contests (12%).

50% of the parents agree that their children know their rights and duties.

While for the students their representation in the Students’ Council is very important (this being the most mentioned form of democracy in the school), and the representatives from the Students’ Council think that this help them to become a better citizen (92%), only 31% of the teachers support this activity. The democratically spirit can be seen more on the student side than on the teacher side.

Despite the fact that all the questioned teachers mentioned their good relation with the local community, most of the students don’t know the community service activities or consider this doesn’t exist (74%). It has been mentioned charitable activities, international projects, ecological activities. 57% of the parents agree that the school answers to the needs of the community.

When they have a problem, the students go to the form-teacher (92%), the number of students who go to the head-master, another teacher, secretary or colleagues being small (1-2%).

This thing presents both positive (good connection between students and the form-teachers) and negative aspects (bad connection with the head of the institution).

The majority of students consider themselves not being involved in solving the conflicts between students (63%). A bigger number consider that they are not involved in solving the conflicts between students and teachers. The conflicts are mainly student-student (72%), but a bigger number mentioned conflicts between students and teacher (53%) and students and security personnel (23%). The students consider there aren't any guiding rules to solve the conflicts (52%), but these are solved with objectivity (73%) and the conflicts are used like examples for learning from mistakes (64%). The majority of students consider the conflicts are not ignored (91%). The members of the School Board think that most of the conflicts are student-student (50%), but a big number mentioned conflicts student-teacher (50%) and teacher-teacher (33%), teacher-parents (63%). 16% of them consider there aren't any conflicts at all. 50% of the parents agreed that the conflicts in school are solved with objectivity. The members of the School Board mentioned the situation where rewards / sanctions were given to the teachers:

- verbal rewards (congratulations) for the results at the contests;
- financial penalties for skipping school regularly.

33% of the questioned members of the School Board mentioned a barrier between the School Board and the rest of the personnel, only 31% of the questioned teachers mentioning a communication with the School Board; 16% of the members of the School Board aren't satisfied because the decisions of the Board are not published and 50% of the questioned members didn't answer. The members also think the parents proposals are used in the school management. 57% of the questioned parents agreed that they receive the necessary information, and 47% consider themselves involved in the decisions taken in the school. 47% of the parents consider the relation between school and family is very good. Only 10% of the parents mentioned activities where they wish to be involved but 75% of the teachers want the parents' involvement and communication with them. This thing can be seen as a difference between the offer of the school and the parents' needs (unattractive or useless activities from the parents' point of view) and a lack of interest on the parents side.

The school atmosphere is considered satisfying by the members of the School Board.

Management – development

The questioned students considered the democrat head-master has to be honest (63%), respectful (32%) and open-minded (31%). The teachers put willingness to communicate (75%) on the first place. Although the two categories have different perception (due to their status and their needs) we can see that the receptivity and willingness to communicate are highly appreciated. Less mentioned qualities are: understanding various things, being active, intelligence, competence, patience, involvement in extracurricular activities, tolerance, and strictness.

The activity of the School Board meets the professional development needs of the teachers, two teachers score this between 0 and 33%, three of them, between 33 and 66% and only one between 66 and 100%. As priorities in teacher's development were mentioned:

- the necessity of the needs analysis;
- the adjustment of the methods and contents to the actual challenges.

About the information flow between the upper levels (ministry, school inspectorate) and the school, 50% of the members of the School Board are happy with it, and 50%, unhappy.

Only 34% of the questioned teachers take part in a project in the school. It is a really small number, if we look at the expectation of the students and parents. A bigger involvement could lead to more and better extracurricular activities.

Another forms of taking part in the school management mentioned by the questioned teachers are:

- the offer of the Curriculum developed by school;
- the “school service” (a teacher is responsible for the things happening in the school during a day);
- the involvement in the administrative activities.

The situation when the teachers where asked about their opinion (mentioned by the members of the School Board) are:

- Teachers’ Council;
- the teaching responsibilities (mainly the number of lessons) of each teacher;
- the organization of some activities.

The questioned teachers wish to be involved in:

- developing and deciding regarding the school Curriculum;
- realizing the School Developing Plan;
- the sanctions;
- the beneficiary of the reward salary (extra 15% of the monthly salary for a year).

The role of the institutional self-evaluation in the school development is considered very important by 50% of the questioned population. 50% of it didn’t answer.

On a scale from 1 to 5, the mark for the democracy in the school, given by the members of the members of the School Board is 3.8, by the teachers is 3.6 and the mark given by the parents is 3.2.

Conclusions

The extremely favorable reaction of the questioned students shows the potential of the school. The fact that they answered enthusiastically and open-minded shows that students are a very valuable resource of our school as well as they think the democratic citizenship and all its forms are really important things. The parents showed availability, answering to the request of the project team. Unfortunately, we can’t say the same thing about the teachers and the members of the School Board, the majority of which didn’t show any interest in this activity.

In the school there is no “evaluation culture”, self-evaluation of teachers and students involvement in evaluation being almost unused.

The student receives information about the human rights at almost all the subjects, but the active-participative methods are used by a small number of teachers.

The school is seen mainly as a provider of information instead of a provider of education and models to be followed, only few of the teachers encouraging the creativity and development of student’s personality.

The willingness to participate in extracurricular activities shown by the students isn’t the same among the teachers, they show a lack of interest in this kind of activities.

The physical environment is appropriate for the teaching-learning process.

The students know their rights and duties; discipline, respecting the rules and good marks being mentioned as the main expectations the school has from them.

The community activities/projects are just few (students' opinion), but the school meets the needs of the community (parents' opinion).

The conflicts are solved with objectivity and the discipline isn't a problem.

The parents' ideas can be found in the decisions the heads of the school make, but the information flow is far from good.

The teacher's involvement in the school management isn't as deep as they wish to be.

The mark for democracy in the school is 3.5 on a scale from 1 to 5, which shows a positive situation.

The project team: Iuliana Turcu, Livia Grigorescu, Aurelia Ioardache, Radulescu Ariadna, Mirela Stefan, Iulia Ioniță

Annex 4 – EDC policy and development plan

Quality Assurance of Education for Democratic Citizenship, TEHNE-CCD, 2007

Democracy Commission Small Grants – US Embassy, Bucharest

„VLADIMIR STREINU” National College, Găești

EDC POLICY

2007-2008

1. EDC Values and Principles

Starting from the premise that we live in a world whose values are like it - in continuous changes, we realize that it depends on each of us how much we understand the need to develop those values that help us understand our aim, our purpose as unique individuals in this diverse world, the values which make the education the basis of a democratic society.

The communication, the motivation, the participation, the continuous training are essential elements in building and developing an organizational culture which promote the EDC values and principles.

An the same time, we think that the school doesn't have to be seen only as the place where the teaching-learning process usually takes place. It is also an institution connected to the family, the local community, the society as a whole, it is the most important place for the personal and social development of the human being.

From this complex perspective, the most important values which our school promotes are:

- responsibility developed through assuming the responsibility, information and professional development, involvement in initiating, organizing, succeeding and evaluating the group activities as well as through the personal example (e.g. maximum responsibility of the students through the example offered by the teachers);
- competitiveness compared with the educational standards and the social command, stimulated by enhancing knowledge, getting new competences, recognizing and valuing the personal or group performances;
- mutual respect which ensures the quality of all interpersonal relationship established horizontally, vertically and diagonally in the organization;
- the access to any kind of information (including politic, social, cultural etc.), the right to opinion, the respect for individual's dignity.

2. Major directions of development

- A. Familiarizing the students with the democratic practice and institutions** through their involvement in projects for the benefit of their community and/or through optional courses with accent on health education, education for quality, education for democratical values, environment education (based on the students' request or the needs identified by the teachers for certain students). The involvement of the students in this kind of projects or in optional courses will lead to the development of the communitarian spirit, to the skills and the attitudes necessary for a good citizen. The students will learn in this way (i.g. learning by doing) that the school works for the community, the school being the main institution meant to produce civilized citizens, involved in the community life.
- B. Encouraging and valuing the teachers' interactive activities** in order to encourage the freedom of speech, respect/accept different points of view, cooperation, development of civic competences like: mutual respect, tolerance, team spirit, competitiveness.

- a. extended use of the interactive methods to as many subjects as possible;
- b. thematical meetings of the teachers committee.

C. The teachers promote a mentorship attitude to their students by:

- a. respecting the students' points of view;
- b. building interpersonal relationship based on dignity, fairness, trust, and self-esteem;
- c. encouraging self-knowledge and self-evaluation;
- d. avoiding the discriminatory treatment and sarcastic attitude;
- e. building a set of principles to be applied consistently, carefully, attentively and diplomatically at the same time.

Individual projects (professional believes applied daily, the students are seen as partners in the moral reconstruction of the profession).

D. Diversifying the forms of collaboration between school and family (making the family a real partner in taking the decision about the school life)

- Involving the Parents Committee in making the local offer.
- Courses with parents on different subjects or themes (communication, mentalities, attitudes and behaviors, solving the conflicts, cultural/social status, education for values, human rights in a democratic society, access to information, professional counseling, information regarding the career etc.).
- Involving the Parents Committee and Parents Board Committee in developing and modernizing the endowment of the school based on the students' needs.
- Diversification of the actions facilitating mutual understanding between teachers and parents as equal partners in their children's education.
- Diverse ways to permanently inform parents regarding the school activities and how they can cooperate with school.
- Involving the parents in activities leading to the development of their children (documentary visits, artistic/sportive activities, projects or extracurricular activities).

3. The main actors' roles/responsibilities

A. Students:

- have initiatives in planning, organizing etc. various activities,
- actively participate in the activities,
- evaluate the activities,
- communicate with the outside entities (community, authorities etc.)

B. Managers:

- don't block the initiative of this team,
- provide the resources,
- inform the upper structures about the projects/activities,
- disseminate the good practice,
- help reward the efforts of the participating teachers.

C. Teachers:

- evaluate the students' knowledge needs,
- involve in extra-class activities,
- approach themes connected to EDC during their form-classes,
- perform a specific work related to their students and report it back to the team periodically.

D. Family:

- states its expectations,
- contributes various resources (time, work etc.),
- observes the activity of the students involved in specific projects,
- evaluates the partnership with the school,
- respects the schedule made by the teachers.

E. Local council / NGOs:

- responds to the school needs,
- see the school as a main provider of education in the community,
- offer the needed information for the school projects,
- disseminate the results of the projects in the community,
- facilitate the necessary partnerships for the projects.

SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PLAN
2007-2008

No.	Development directions	Objectives	Activities	Human resources/Responsibilities	Other resources (material, financial)	Deadline	Proofs of success (indicators)
1.	Familiarizing the students with the democratic practice and institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - using all curricular and extracurricular opportunities, (form classes, optional courses, subjects from the area „Man and Society”, projects supported by the European Union grants) to form the civic competences, - guiding the Students' Council to the active and responsible participation of the students in the school life 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - evaluating how the EDC objectives of different subjects (Romanian language, History, Geography) are met, - planning and teaching the form-classes based on the concrete needs of the class /school - creating optional EDC courses in 2008-2009 the school year, - analysing the opportunity of using some aspects of the EDC Project of the Ministry of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Member in the School Board and the Committee for quality assurance - Elena Popescu - Teachers of different socio-humanistic subjects - Teachers in charge of the Students Council - Iulia Ioniță - The president of the Students Council - Popescu Robert 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Curriculum and the managerial plan of the teachers - EDC, EHR Guides - Courses for teachers - The web-site of the Ministry of Education - Students questionnaires - The piggy bank of the students - candidates for the Students Council 	<p>All the time</p> <p>All the time</p> <p>March 2008</p> <p>November 2007</p>	<p>Posters of the candidates</p> <p>Plan / matrix of the activities of the Students' Council</p> <p>Articles in the local press and the school magazine</p> <p>Photos from different activities</p> <p>Various work of the students, including questionnaires</p> <p>Notes/Reports of teachers observing the lessons/activities</p> <p>More self confident students</p>

Education (using the web-site www.civica-online.ro as a resource)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - organizing the Students' Council through election at each class - setting rules for the Students' Council based on democratic principles - giving precise attribution to the members the Students' Council - activities based on the concrete needs and interests of the students - specific analysis of the questionnaires applied to the students (from the project Quality Assurance in EDC) to plan the most helpful activities. 				October 2007
					October 2007
					October 2007
					Permanent
					October 2007

2.	Encouraging and valuing the teachers' interactive activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - establishing partnerships in planning, teaching, and evaluation for foreign languages, Geography and Romanian language - setting up a partnership between French - Geography - History teachers in using the interactive methods and approaching EDC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - searching some European partners necessary for the school development - cross-subject approach to some themes - applying the same interactive methods within more subjects/classes and analysing the activities 	Ariadna Rădulescu Iulia Ioniță Aurelia Iordache / The analysis of the questionnaire for the teachers, students, School Committee	Data base for searching partners Materials gathered by the teachers	November 2007 March 2008 Permanent	Lesson plans Questionnaires filled by the students Products of the students The teachers' opinions Written reports of the involved teachers
3.	The teachers promote a mentorship attitude to their students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - developing respect for the others' points of view - encouraging the initiatives for the benefit of the community / class - enhancing the critical thinking of the pilot group - developing the competences of self-evaluation and peer-evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - setting up a group of students and teachers who will function based on a set of principles accepted / established by them - activities and common steps of the group - activities with students / teachers in the 	Turcu Iuliana Ștefan Mirela Rădulescu Ariadna	Feed-back forms	October 2007 Permanent Permanent	Feed-back form from the participants at the activities and self-evaluation forms teacher-teacher, teacher -students, students-students Feed-back forms from the Teachers Committee

4.	Diversifying the forms of collaboration between school and family	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - permanent and diverse information of parents regarding the school activities and the way of working together with school - involving the parents in concrete projects for the benefit of the students (parents will contribute more than money) 	<p>main role (the others will assist and give the feed-back)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -filling anonymous feed-back forms at the Teachers Committee 	Grigorescu Livia Iordache Aurelia Ioniță Iulia Bănilă Alexandru	<p>Founds from the Parents Committee Information Board</p>	<p>Every meeting of the Teachers Committee</p> <p>Permanent</p> <p>June 2008</p> <p>October 2007</p>	<p>Pictures from the activities + the minutes</p> <p>Information Board</p> <p>Students' projects</p> <p>Feed-back from the beneficiary of the projects posted on the web-site of the school</p>
----	---	--	---	--	--	--	---